DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 091 347 SP 008 016

AUTHOR Gazzetta, Vincent; And Others
TITLE Is This What We Want? The Report of a Conference on Performance Based Teacher Education.
INSTITUTION Adelphi Univ., Garden City, N.Y.
PUB DATE 30 Nov 73
NOTE 54p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$3.15 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Dissent; *Educational Theories; *Opinions; *Performance Based Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

This collection of articles presents some pros and cons of performance-based teacher education (PBTE). In the first article, Vincent Gazzetta presents a case for PBTE. He lists 12 areas of concern in teacher education and discusses five issues regarding concepts of competency-based systems. The issues are that a) the definition of competency-based teacher education imposes a single mechanistic system of teacher education; b) competency-based teacher education is anti-intellectual; c) there is no adequate research base; d) there is lack of an adequate financial support base; and e) the mandate of joint governance presents significant problems. The other three articles present cases against PBTE. Harry Broudy discusses three reservations he has about PBTE, which are that a) PBTE lacks one significant definition; b) PBTE is not an adequate approach to the preparation of the all-around teacher; and c) PBTE is based on too much theory. Albert Shanker states that performance contracting and competency-based certification are quackery and explains why he believes this. Sheldon Stoff examines 12 shortcomings of the imposed model of teacher education in New York State. He states that the model a) has no empirical base, b) is Skinnerian in its definitions of psychological and philosophical truth, c) offers a distorted view of teaching and learning, d) industrializes education, e) is anti-intellectual, and f) denies freedom to the university and the student. (PD)

ED 091347

'S THIS WHAT WE WANT?

The Report of a Conferenc
On Performance Based
Teacher Education

Adelphi University
November 30, 1973

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Speakers:

Dr. Vincent Gazzetta	Director of the Division of Teacher Education and Certification New York State Department of Education
Dr. Harry Broudy	Professor of Philosophy of Education University of Illinois
Mr. Albert Shanker	President, United Federation of Teachers, New York City
Dr. Sheldon Stoff	Chairman, Department of Education Adelphi University

SP 008 075

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface

The Case For Performance Based Teacher Education

Dr. Vincent Gazzetta 1

The Case Against Performance Based Teacher Education

Dr. Harry Broudy 13

Mr. Albert Shanker 22

Dr. Sheldon Stoff 34

Conference Resolution 48

Shall a man lose himself in countless masses of adjustments, and be so shaped with reference to this, that, and the other, that the simply good and healthy and brave parts of him are reduced and clipped away, like the bordering of box in a garden? — Whitman

Many states have been moving with a maximum of speed and a minimum of publicity towards a performance (or competency) - based concept of teacher education (PBTE). A conference to discuss this movement was held at Adelphi University on November 30, 1973. The addresses that were given there are the content of this volume.

Performance-based teacher education has been mandated by New York State. Dr. Vincent Gazzetta, in the first address in this vol-

time, gives a very strong statement supporting the State's position. Dr. Gazzetta makes his appeal for PBTE on the basis of what he considers to be both idealism and practicality. He undertakes to show that all the objections to and criticisms of the idea that certification should be based on each prospective teacher's ability to achieve predetermined quantitatively measurable objectives are groundless. He presents forcefully the arguments that have persuaded so many states, in addition to New York, to consider adoption of this new way of training and evaluating teachers. Dr. Gazzetta's statement of principle is followed by strongly felt and strongly voiced objections from three quarters. The reader is given the chance to consider the question and to make up his own mind.

What is the nub of the matter? Advocates of PBTE, noting the dissatisfaction with education today, claim that we need a method of proving achievement. They believe that through PBTE they have a way to call teachers to account, and departments of education as well. Teacher education should take place largely in the public schools themselves, they maintain, rather than be university-based. The layman can understand this kind of talk. He would certainly like to see better results coming out of the classroom. He hears that there is a new form of teacher training and evaluation called PBTE, and he is ready to buy it.

What is the position of Dr. Harry Broudy, Dr. Sheldon Stoff, and Mr. Albert Shanker? They agree that our schools are in trouble but they disagree with both the diagnosis and the prescription. Quack medicines can sometimes lead to much worse results than the illness they mean to cure. In the eyes of these critics, the languishing and in some cases degenerate condition of education today is the result of complex social problems. Certainly we can hold teachers responsible for failures that are legitimately theirs, but to put the whole burden on them is to avoid facing basic causes. Research has not indicated that PBTE is the hoped for panacea. But neither is it an innocuous fad. Its failure will not be a quiet, unnoticed, flop. Critics believe they speak for the common sense and practical experience of the great majority of actual teachers when they insist vehemently that PBTE's concepts of accountability are sure to end

in disaster.

Why a disaster? If children are not to become machines, only what is distinctively human should be dominant in their education. In the content they study, in the evaluation of their teachers, in relations among the people who direct the programs, there must be primary concern for the enhancement of life, and life is far more than "systems."

At a time when our nation so badly needs depth of understanding, the filling of moral and spiritual vacuums, and a renewed love of learning, PBTE would concentrate on infinitely subdivided scraps of information and thousands of petty skills taught through "modules" and packets. Aspects of the child that defy packaging will assert themselves in a rebellion that will make the present moral apathy of students, the drugs and sex orientation, the anarchical outbreaks, seem pale by comparison.

Materials that take responsibility away from teachers and put it in the hands of kit manufacturers, weaken teaching. They cannot improve present teachers in any fundamental way nor can they attract new teachers. Creative minds do not want to be "classroom managers." What we should be evaluating in the performance of teachers is the degree of enthusiasm they can engender, the imagination they can use to develop ideas or skills, and the strength of character they can bring into a classroom.

Yes, we need closer checks on these qualities, but the evaluation, if it is not to be as mechanized and ineffective as the modules, must also be a distinctively human process. Is it really true that human judgment is, in the end, less objective than standardized tests? Certainly, say our critics, we must insist upon evaluation at each step of the way, but let us not supplant human judgment with mechanized gimmicks.

Pre-professional participation in the actual schools has been increased and should, as Mr. Shanker urges, include internships. But the surest way to defeat these ends is to set up complicated and expensive bureaucratic structures. The fallacy of supposedly fool-

proof written agreements among all parties involved in the direction of schools is seen as soon as we recognize that such agreements are based not upon trust but upon mutual suspicion. They lead to a jockeying within a power structure, subverting the harmony that they allegedly serve. A systems approach increases neither responsibility nor genuine accountability; it diffuses responsibility and industrializes the whole of education.

The publishers of this volume believe that PBTE is not just another fad. It is a crucial issue, the outcome of which will determine not only the health of education but the future of our society.

Dr. Patricia Brown

Mr. Henry Liebhart

An address by
Dr. Vincent Gazzetta

I believe that participants in this meeting are to get copies of the remarks made by the presentors on the panel. The remarks that I prepared some two weeks ago are the ones which you will be getting. However, during the intervening period I decided I wanted to say most of the same things but somewhat differently. Consequently, if you read my previously prepared remarks they may seem unfamiliar to you.

As those of us involved in administering a legal State responsibility have, over the past several years, looked objectively and seriously at that responsibility, we have grown steadily disenchanted. The State system, and New York's procedures for teacher education and certification fall into my definition of a system, is not doing what it was and is supposed to do. The system is not capable of discriminating between the competent and those who merely complete college courses. Please remember that I am not talking about individuals. You and I both know there are thousands of competent persons in the public schools. My point is that the State system is unable to deal with the differences and by tradition – all

130 years of tradition -- by implication, by intent, and by policy, it is supposed to be able to deal with the differences.

From our own concern, meetings and discussions, I believe there are at least twelve general statements about which agreement can be reached. They are:

Preparatory programs (pre and inservice) can be and should be improved.

Research about teaching and knowledge generated by preparation is inadequate.

There is a lack of concensus about desireable behaviors that professional staff in the schools should possess. Procedures to assess professional staff performance need improvement.

Teaching is both an art and a science.

Preparatory programs differ in detail but are largely similar in conceptualization.

Lack of funds pose problems in attempting to improve preparatory programs.

The funding base for pre-service programs is not likely to be expanded.

Public schools have not been formally involved in planning, developing, implementing and evaluating pre-service preparatory programs.

Preparatory programs rarely provide for pre-assessment of students.

Generally preparatory programs do not formally follow up on their graduates.

Present certification systems do not differentiate between holders of provisional and permanent certificates beyond at-

testing to the fact that holders of permanent certificates have completed a specified number of graduate credits.

Our own concerns and voices from the field led us to search for a means by which the system might be changed to more adequately meet its responsibilities and at the same time address at least some of the twelve generalizations.

Up until very recently I have not hesitated to say that we are moving toward a competency based system. However, a definitional problem of serious proportions has developed which makes me much more hesitant to make that announcement. I am finding that the term "competency based" opens the door to a myriad of definitions many of which are tied to behavioral objectives, skill development, modularized instruction, and all the other system terminology that tend to create a stereotypic image of a dull grey robot with a toneless, electronic – type voice, who searches its skill-jammed memory bank for the proper action in any and all particularly specified instances.

Let me here and now speak for the Regents, the Commissioner, and the staff of the State Education Department in clearly and aggressively denouncing that definition as THE mandate imposed by New York.

The Regents have voiced, as policy, what the tradition, legislative intent and implication have sought of certification. The Policy is that "the system shall assure the public that certified personnel in the schools shall possess and maintain demonstrated competence to enable children to learn." While that is stated policy, it cannot be fully attained in its most literal sense at this time. But we can begin to work toward it.

With that understanding firmly in mind we are moving toward a competency based system that has a functional definition which requires approved preparatory programs to:

1. Have a broader base of governance including, at the minimum, representation from the professional staff of school district's administration as well as the institution of higher education.

2. State publicaly and as explicitly as possible what knowledge, skills and attitudes the graduate is expected to attain.

3. State publicaly and as explicitly as possible what evidence is acceptable to show that the required expectations have been achieved by the graduates.

4. State what evidence is acceptable to show that the required expectations are appropriate.

5. Provide for a corrective action system to permit program modification where necessary.

Let me pause here for a moment for an additional word on the last two items mentioned. Because we do not have the evidence which tells us what staff skills, knowledge, and attitudes which directly promote learning in children, I believe that logic and tradition will serve as the foundation for identifying the desired competencies. It is then incumbent on the preparatory program to not only insure the attainment of the competencies, but to establish a means by which the effect of those competencies on children can be evaluated and the program modified as and where necessary.

That is the sum and substance of the definition as it is being used by this State. Granted, it does not preclude the preparation of dull, grey robots but neither does it restrict the preparation of professional staff whose competencies are embedded in descriptive terms such as joy, zest, curiosity, awe, wonder, or humor. I've identified both ends of the continuum and have done so purposefully. New York's definition of a competency based system must be able to accommodate both ends as well as everything in between.

Paul Nash in the AACTE publication entitled "A Humanistic Approach to Performance-Based Teacher Education" indicates that "A performance-based program that meets humanistic criteria, will be one that serves to enhance the unique teaching learning style of each individual." Also he states that, "what most affects students is the interaction around the edges of formal pedagogy, the incidentals of classroom life, the spontaneous responses that come from the depths of the teacher's personality rather than her trained reactions, which she is liable to forget in crisis or when she is unselfconscious."

It strikes me that there are few people that would disagree with Nash's comments. And preparatory programs which respond to those comments would not be unacceptable to the Department. But what those programs must do is state what the program expectations are, how they are to be assessed, and how they will be evaluated.

Granted there are problems of assessment and evaluation inherent in such a program, but I'm told that there are many programs of preparation in New York that fully embody the humanistic approach and have done so for years. It seems reasonable to me to assume that if "humanistic concerns" were and are the focus of programs then, in some way, the program knows what it expects and has ways of knowing whether its expectations are being met.

If we look at the concepts of competency based systems there are a number of issues on which discussion typically centers. I guess I've already touched on the first issue which can be titled: <u>The definition of competence based teacher education imposes a single mechanistic system of teacher education</u> but I'd like to stay with it for one other comment.

There are only two limits or constraints imposed on preparatory programs by the Department. One is that a baccalaureate degree will continue to be required for all the certification areas in which it is presently required. The second is that the legal provisions concerning the ill effects of drugs, alcohol, and tobacco must be met.

Beyond those two elements preparatory programs are free to design, develop, and implement any program; be it mechanistic and atomized, holistic and humane, or a combination thereof.

But in each instance the expectations and the assessments both individual and programmatic must be stated publicaly and as explicitly as possible.

Ladies and gentlemen, for years the Department has jammed the most specific program requirements down your throats. And they probably represent the most inhumane, and rigid, set of mandates that could be imagined. Yet when the Department opens and frees the system, the criticism is couched in terms such as – single system mandate, mechanistic, etc. I could understand incredulity, but I cannot understand attacks on a system that attempts to meet the concerns and criticisms that have been voiced and a system which moves away from central control of program content and places the responsibility on those who should know best.

Issue II. Competency Based Teacher Education is Anti-Intellectual.

If a competency based program in this State is anti-intellectual, then its anti-intellectualism can be directly attributed to the developers of the program.

The guidelines for program submission, now more than ever, demand that program development be based on a definition of the role and responsibilities of the professional position being prepared.

While this requirement mandates that a conceptual role be stated, it goes no further in specifying what that conception is to be, thus it permits – even encourages: 1) a response to New York's diversified population and subsequent diversified educational needs, and/or 2) the capability of looking toward the schools of tomorrow and the staffing needs of those schools.

The question must be turned around to ask whether there is a philosophical, conceptual, or intellectual approach which cannot be accommodated? For if there is an intellectual approach that cannot be accommodated, proper modifications need to be made. In this last instance I'm referring to the inclusion of a conceptual model within New York's CBTE framework, not a philosophical stance which rejects the public explication of expectations and assessments.

One other comment is appropriate. If you will look at what's been written or said by Department staff members, I do not believe you will see anything related to a mandate regarding how the educational program to prepare persons for professional roles in the schools is to be carried out. There's no mandate about hours, courses, modules, tasks, lecture, seminar, independent study or any other program format. Here again, it is not for the State to tell those who are doing, how to best do it. We're convinced that you are as eager to do things in the way or ways that they can best be done as anyone else.

Some concern has been voiced about our emphasis on "individualized." Perhaps that was a poor word choice. Our intent may be better conveyed by using the work "personalized." That, I think, gets at a philosophical stance of bringing each student from where he or she is to the desired level of capability. Yet it does not carry with it the image of only a one-to-one teacher-learner ratio.

Issue III: There is no Adequate Research Base

I am not sure what the reference base is for this statement. If, on one hand, it refers to the inability to make a direct linkage between staff behavior and children's performance - then I will agree without hesitation.

The need for a research base under any other reference cannot be considered as a valid reason to delay movement unless New York intended to establish a list of minimum competencies to which preparatory programs would have to respond.

Instead, the responsibilities are being delegated, under State supervision, to the professional community who for years have prepared, employed and served with professionals. Who better to make a judgement about the efficacy of the program and its components?

The basic validation research must be done, yet we must also have the appropriate conditions to permit the research to be accomplished. There are no better groups than those I've mentioned to establish the conditions for the needed research and to then be able to appropriately respond to the research findings.

Adequate conditions do not now exist to permit the research to be completed. But the CBTE framework does permit the conditions to be established. For example: the Rosner report of 1972 suggests that three conditions must exist before a program can be validated. They are; 1) the preparatory program has to show evidence of staff growth in specified competencies. 2) The school system must provide evidence of pupil progress in the attainment of specific educational objectives. 3) A research design must be developed to study the relationship between the two sets of measures. If either set of measures is missing it is impossible to carry out the research essential to establish the validity of the program. We may have to begin with stating the expectations on the basis of logic and tradition. But in doing so we also are establishing the capability of testing and modifying as deemed necessary.

Issue IV. <u>There is a lack of an Adequate Financial Support Base.</u>

There needs to be adequate financial support for any program of preparation. However, the question is: What resources are presently available to support a program of preparation under New York's CBTE guidelines?

I'll be absolutely frank. I do not have hard data to support either agreement or disagreement with the issue. The literature seems to indicate that the major costs are human costs. Such, of course is the case under the present system and the challenge is to see if we

can creatively use personnel in different ways.

While empirical evidence is needed to respond to the question of costs, some clues do seem to exist.

It is interesting to note that currently almost 25% of the colleges and universities in the State report movement toward a competency based program using their own resources.

There are some resources which should be subjected to close scrutiny to see if they can be used differently. Among them are:

1. Do we need to support college student teaching supervisors in the same way we now do? What are the pros and cons in assigning them to a single or cluster of districts where they can provide expertise to inservice staff as well as preservice.

2. Can student teachers, as we presently call them, be used in different configurations which will permit some released time for public school personnel? Under what conditions can persons-in-training be used to provide instruction and/or support instruction without the constant presence of the full-time staff members? Can one regular staff member supervise more than one person in training?

3. Are there ways that staff development funds allocated by school districts can be used to support an aspect of teacher education? Can a resident college staff member providing needed inservice to existing staff release some hard cash to pay for substitutes thus permitting regular staff to participate in teacher education activities?

4. Can tuition waivers granted to public school personnel be used with greater effectiveness? Could tuition waivers be pooled to in turn provide certain needed services to the building or district staff as a whole?

While I am not ready to say extra money will or will not be need-

ed, it is incumbent on all of us to try to identify what is presently spent and how those dollars might be used differently. I'd be almost willing to bet right now that most colleges have little or no idea what teacher education presently costs. I'll also bet that few, if any, school districts really know what they spend on staff development.

It's important to re-emphasize the fact that the publications, even those that New York helped to sponsor, are sent out for informational purposes. They are not State publications sent out as specific guidelines. They are for information and consideration.

New York and the Multi-State Consortium have awarded a contract for the development of such a cost analysis system. I hope this system will be ready for use in the Fall of 1974.

Another possible expense, especially in the time of transition, is the development of new resources and materials. A fantastic amount of material is being produced in the nation today and consideration should be given to what exists. Again, New York and the Multi-State Consortium have contracted for the publication of the most up-to-date compendium of resources available. I'm speaking of the publication by Bob Houston related to resources to support CBTE programs. The original publication has already been sent to the colleges and universities. The update which, by the way, is almost as large as the original will be off the presses early in 1974. We have kept and will keep sufficient copies of those two publications to provide consortia as they are established.

There is also a publication by Bob Houston related to developing CBTE programs, also the Florida Catalog of Competencies. Both of these publications have been sent out.

Issue V. The mandate of joint governance presents significant problems.

Concern has been expressed over; 1) the ability of all the parties to provide equal resources and 2) the differing priorities of the vari-

ous parties. At the same time the voices of the many segments of the educational community have urged closer and more intimate involvement of public school personnel in preparation.

Both the Regents' Plan and the implementing guidelines reflect the need for a collaborative approach to the planning, development, implementation, and evaluation of preparatory programs by at least representation from the professional staff, the school district, and the higher education institution.

Heretofore the institutions of higher education have been the dominant force in the preparation of teachers and the roles and responsibilities have been quite clear. Although all teacher preparing institutions have used the public schools to varying degrees as training sites, the contributions of school personnel have been limited largely to those of the cooperating teachers.

The intent behind the new requirement is the promotion of multiple viewpoints in the creation and administration of teacher education programs. Such a consortial arrangement would have other salutary effects – the facilitation of field-based learning experiences which go beyond a few months of student teaching and the cultivation of a new relationship between the schools and colleges which might enhance inservice education opportunities.

An effort to develop a truly cooperative program is marked by certain problems caused by the coming together of several agencies each of which has goals more overarching than teacher education and each of which has a different perception of and stake in teacher education. There is widespread concern among teacher educators in colleges that they alone are ultimately accountable for the preparation program and if that program is unsuccessful or if their collaborators obstruct program development or implementation, it will be they in the colleges who suffer. Public school personnel have expressed a fear that the colleges will go their own way after permitting only token participation by the schools.

Without attempting to belittle the time and effort necessary to

develop an open and truly cooperative relationship, I'd like to suggest four items that are necessary for success. If these four are not present the chances for success go downhill rapidly.

1. Sufficient time needs to be allocated for each agency to become well acquainted with the others; the foundations of an open and trusting relationship need to be built properly.

2. Each agency should have an opportunity to discuss those roles, responsibilities, and program characteristics which they feel are non-negotiable because of ideological, legal, or institutional considerations.

3. How decisions are to be made and how the parties will work together not only need to be discussed, but agreements need, in fact must, be put in writing.

4. Those persons working together actually serve to speak for many many others; consequently, the development of a communication system, with an open mike at both ends, is an absolute imperative.

Competency based teacher education and certification in New York is designed to permit preparatory programs to have a measure of freedom heretofore unknown in this State. At the same time it requires that those programs accept the responsibility of assessing their program and progress. In short the system says:

1. Tell what you expect your graduates to know and be able to do.

2. Identify how you'll know when it's accomplished, and,

3. Identify how you'll know that what you're doing is appropriate.

An address by
Dr. Harry Broudy

Even though our time is limited, I must take just a moment or two to give you two parables that may save some time later because you will be able to make the application yourselves.

The first one is related to the question of telling the difference between competent teachers and non-competent teachers, a parable that comes from Dr. Seuss, appropriately enough. It seems that two brothers inherited two horses and they wanted to be able to tell them apart, so they decided to nick the ear of one and not the other. This worked very well until the other horse went through a barbed wire fence. They decided to chop the tail off one of the horses and that worked very well until the other horse backed into a buzz saw. Finally they said, "Let's stop horsing around and measure," and they did, and they found the black horse was two inches shorter than the white horse.

The other parable is this and it concerns my role in this program. I am listed as a philosopher, and I am reminded of the time I was invited to attend a conference on the education of the disadvantaged (remember, this was in vogue about eight years ago). Now they have defined "disadvantaged" out of the window, but at that time we used to talk about the disadvantaged. The Chairman of the Conference said, "We would like to have you come down and participate," and I reminded him that this was a matter which required professional expertise – anthropology, sociology, etc. "Well," he said, "You don't understand. We have plenty of people who know what they are talking about. We would like you to come down to be philosophical about it."

My talk today is philosophical in the very worst sense of the word because it does try to examine some concepts to elucidate the meaning of what people say, and try to hazard a guess as to what the consequences would be if these words were used strictly and seriously. May I repeat that, strictly and seriously, and as a member of the guild called philosophy, that is about all I can do. If that isn't relevant to your conference, my speech is over.

I think you will see the meaning of that second parable as I go along. My present job really is to ask what in the world is the significant meaning of "competence" and of "performance"? What in the devil is either term intended to deny? Obviously, nobody wants an incompetence-based program. So what is being said? The term "performance based" teacher--and I am using it in the sense they are using it, not in New York alone, but in the country, as I have found it in the literature – presumably has a significant opposite, something called "non-performance-based" teacher education in various forms. One of these would be an idea-based program, or it could be a promise-based program, that is, promise versus performance. Another one would be a preparational program to prepare someone to do something, but now we are not going to prepare them, by God, we are going to have an operational program; they are going to be able to do it.

Now I can understand a significant movement to argue for perfor-

mance and competence-based teacher programs, if they are intended to oppose vigorously and seriously, their opposites. There are often empty promises, preparations that don't prepare, programs based on ideas and theories that can't be demonstrated, and my talk is based entirely on the premise that these words can be used significantly. But as you heard this morning already, at least one advocate of this program has no intention of using these terms in a strict, narrow sense. Nothing is excluded from competency or performance, even those subjective states that Paul Nash was talking about. Now I confess if we include everything under this, there is no reason for opposing it. On the other hand, I see no reason for advocating it either. What then is its significance? Presumably what is wanted is a set of overt behaviors, movements, motions, that anybody with normal eyes and ears can see and verify that they have taken place. It is not enough to say what your objectives are; the point is to phrase them as behaviors that will not require that an expert make a judgment. And that, of course, is the crux of the whole behavioral objective movement. Those who have been most active in this, those who have made the most money on this, are, of course, the people in behavioral modification and those who are manufacturing the kits with its lists of performances which will be used in judging the outcomes.

Now, what observable conditions shall be regarded as unambiguous signs about such things as explaining, discussing, reasoning? What unambiguous signs shall we pick that will say these activities are being performed at all, or performed well? What abstract models of these activities do we have with which these teacher performances can be compared? Is there any evidence that could count as proof that teachers are motivating their classrooms? Is there any one set of unambiguous acts that constitutes proof of explaining, understanding, etc? Whether the activity is being performed well or poorly, is it enough that the action follow some pre-specified model or does the proof lie in the pupil. And how much time do you give the pupil to deliver the goods? How long do you wait to decide whether or not an appreciation of literature has really come about?--Five years?--Ten years? Twenty years? Or is it, as Aristotle

said, that you can't really tell whether man has had a happy life until he is dead, because in the last moments he may suffer great distress? How are we going to evaluate these things? On the epitaph? And if it is the pupil's behavior, what behavior on the part of the pupil can be specified in advance to guarantee that the teacher has really explained something? What if the pupil is not interested in the matter?

I don't want to say that we can't tell when these activities are going on or whether they are going on well. My point is that, in PBTE, we make these judgments by observing an overt operation, such as speech, specified in advance. One of the problems of testing has always been to find simple signs of "understanding" that could not be faked by rote learnings. It seems clear to me, although not to my critics, that either PBTE must stick to a strict meaning of performance as overt, unambiguously identifiable results, specified in advance, in which case it cannot claim that certain intellectual and emotional processes are performances--or it can broaden the meaning of performance to include these processes, in which case it must concede the ambiguity and unclarity of programs that claim to produce competence in intellectual and affective processes.

Of course, it can be said that strictness is out of place in so complex an enterprise as teacher education, that one is as strict as the complexity permits and as the circumstances demand. This is an eminently sensible view, and it leads to a position that can be supported wholeheartedly, namely, that there are some, but not all, components of teaching that do lend themselves to translation into overt procedures that can be observed and judged with considerable reliability. But this is quite different from the barrage of propaganda that claims for PBTE the power to remedy the evils of conventional programs such as their promises to develop in prospective teachers capacities that are so vague as to be useless for evaluation of the product.

As far as I can make out, the promotional literature wants to have it both ways; it uses the strict interpretation of performance when

it wants to criticize the conventional programs, but it shifts to the broader, looser, more hospitable, use of the term in defending against charges of narrowness and mindless behavior, if a technical tautology is permissible. Does PBTE intend to define itself over and against promise-based program? Or is a PBTE program, strictly interpreted, a promise? If the PBTE program promises, suppose you took everything one would want, specified everything in advance--"8 ball in the side pocket"--and then you devised tests to ascertain without any ambiguity whether it had been done--is that a promise? Can you now predict the probability that youthful behavior will be of a certain kind? There is no controversy on the question. There is no research to warrant any such conclusion. So even strictly interpreted, rigorously carried out, it is still a promise-based program.

Now there is one way to get out of the promise-based program--not to have any. Don't make any promises. Don't practice for the future--practice in the present. This is a very respectable form of training, the apprentice system of training, and there is nothing wrong with it. You don't study to do something, you do it. There is no question of promises. The apprentice at every stage of the game is demonstrating his competence, and when the master gets tired of guiding him, or he doesn't think he needs any more guidance, he is on his own; and when he is on his own, he does what he has been doing all along. So there is a possibility of getting out of promise-based programs.

You can do it by going to the apprentice system, or you could go to a technician training program, similar to the way you train an auto mechanic. There is nothing wrong with this. There is nothing unrespectable about it. But if this is what we want, let's say so. Why do we need general education? Why a baccalaureate? There is no way of proving the baccalaureate does one thing to improve performance in a classroom. We had wonderful teachers before there were colleges. "The best teacher I ever had never went beyond high school", we hear. What do you prove? All you prove is

that you can train a monkey up to a certain level of excellence on any performance you might pick and if the monkey can't do it, you can divide the performance in two parts and get two monkeys. I am driving this to the extreme, but that is the only way to see the absurdity of the argument. Now if we want to go in that direction, let's say so. Let's recruit students right out of the high schools, put them in junior colleges for two years, and get all the paraprofessionals doing all the performances that you can list. However, we are producing lists of performances faster than we can train personnel.

My second set of reservations about the whole business is that regardless of what is said in the literature, there is a type of teaching that does lend itself to the PBTE approach. It is what I call "didactic", and in our field, friends, you can call anything by any name. You have classification, I have classification. You have a theory, I have a theory. You analyze teaching one way, I analyze it another; there is no way of preventing anybody from saying anything about education. So I call it didactics. It simply means "laying it out". It can be specific content, it can be in the form of rules, principles; you learn them by rote. This is an important form of teaching and the one to which pedagogy has given the greatest amount of attention. It lends itself to programming, to segmentation into bits and modules that can be sequenced, practiced, tested, combined, etc. It is an idea for computer-aided instruction. For in doing didactics--and it is important to do them, I don't denigrate didactics,--the lecturing teacher at best is no more than an indifferent, efficient machine.

But there are other kinds of teaching. I call them heuristics, that is, teaching pupils to discover and perfect their performance of thinking and imagining, through dialogue and discussion. These can't be programmed and, insofar as the results are not products but rather intellectual habits, it may take a long post-school period to develop them fully. It is difficult to see what heuristic performances can be prespecified or practiced by the teachers. Can you train heuristic teachers by didactic methods?

Similarly there is a third kind of teaching I call philetics. It comes from the Greek word "philos" meaning love, and I include under it, for brevity, everything that is now referred to as "relating". You may fill in all the other things it means to you. Establishing rapport with people, being humane, that intangible aura of sensitivity or of friendship, the business of alienation, redemption--let's call the whole thing philetics. There may be procedure or "how to's" for organizing philetics like group therapy or sensitivity sessions, but these are quite subordinate to understanding people and to actually being sensitive to a wide range of affective nuances which are not prespecifiable procedures.

There is, therefore, the danger, and I think it's a real one. If you look at what is being produced, I don't think the danger is a straw man. There is a danger that PBTE will do only what they do best, teaching didactics and reducing things to procedures governed by a set of rules, if there is more to schooling than didactics, important as these are, then PBTE is not an adequate approach to the preparation of the all-around teacher, and it would be more seemly for its proponents to proclaim honestly that they have a scheme for improving didactics. It may be true that conventional programs don't even prepare teachers to do didactics well, but it would be hard to deny that, bad as some of them are, they do have some hope of making the teacher aware of the importance of heuristics and philetics as well as didactics.

Now, I take up a third area very quickly, which could be a long story; let's see if we can condense it. Conventional programs have traditionally included kinds of material which would make up for the lack of empirical generalizations necessary for considering education as a science. That is why we can't move with any degree of certainty from any instrumentation to a result. Twenty-five years from now you may be addressed by people who may have something like that, but it's more likely to come from the people who are working on drugs and neuro-surgery than from those who are working on learning. But, right now, we do not have strong empirical generalizations from which we can deduce rules and facts.

We've said teachers are to be able to construct contexts in which the teaching occurs, historical contexts, moral ones, social ones, aesthetic ones. This was the entire hope of the teacher education process for the last 50 years. That's why we think general education is important because only people who've had it can construct and fund it.

Now what happens to these things in PBTE? It is just impossible to stand up and say ahead of time what the criteria will be that will determine whether or not teachers can do this contextual work. Sure, we can ask them to write the history of the problem or the social implications of it, but do you really need those experiences to do the thing? It won't help me to organize my class Wednesday morning if I know the history of discipline any more than it helps me to start my car on a cold morning to know that I've taken a course in thermodynamics and even in automotive engineering at one time in my career. I don't even know where the carburetor is in my car; my mechanic does.

So if performance is the thing, not only does one not need theory, but theory is a positive hindrance to doing things in a specified way. Where does most of the criticism come in the standard program? Too much theory. We don't have to understand it to know that we have something to cope with here. I do not take too seriously the affirmation that PBTE is not anti-intellectual. It isn't if you do not take the term seriously. If you do take it seriously, it would be very hard to find the rationale for anything except rule-following procedures. And there will be people in the system who will be blessed with great wisdom, who will know what the rules will be, but it won't be the teachers.

Let me bring this to a close. I think, my friends, that the American public will learn what it wants of education the way it learns most things, by catastrophe. We learned of catastrophies of physiology from the ailments of Presidents Eisenhower, Johnson and Kennedy--that is when we learned about ileitis. We learned about moral diseases through Watergate, and we will learn what our priorities are in schooling when the schools of Detroit, New York or Chi-

cago are closed not only for three weeks but for a couple of years. Then the public will begin to understand what it is that it really wants and what it can get for the dollar. Until that time, I am afraid that every venture, every gimmick, every performance proposal or procedure that makes it possible to get a teacher-proof curriculum will be tried. A package of materials that even an idiot couldn't spoil is the idea; a series of procedures that even a monkey couldn't spoil. These will be very attractive to the legislator who is now facing something intolerable and must do something.

I apologize for being so abstract about this and I know you have more concrete concerns about how to do it and things of that kind, but if this elucidation has any merit and if it means anything to trace these consequences, not in terms of what the well-intentioned advocates of it say, but in terms of what it might lead to if carried through strictly, then this is about all I can contribute.

Thank you very much.

In appreciation to Dr. Mildred Hardeman for her audiotape of Dr. Broudy's address.

An address by
Mr. Albert Shanker

Mr. Chairman, friends and colleagues. The topic we are discussing today has very great importance. It has great importance because--within a very short time--the attitude and views of most of the American people have changed towards teachers and public education. The reason for the change is probably the great success of public education in this country.

Great confidence in public schools and teachers existed as long as a great educational gap existed between the majority and the educated. The immigrant parent looked up to the teacher because the mass of the population at the time was illiterate or semi-literate. Teachers were among the few that could read, write and count. Schools have succeeded to the extent that the majority of the population now is literate; but it is notable that there are very few who do not believe they are better educated than the teachers who are teaching their children. They believe they could do a better job except they are making more money than teachers so they delegate that responsibility to others. The optimism most people had

for the public schools was shattered further in the 1960's with the discovery that poverty continued to exist in our society. There were still large numbers of students leaving school as functional illiterates, not reading or writing; less able to function in our society than 10, 20, 30 or 40 years before, because of the lesser need for muscle power. Furthermore, there were indications that we really did not know what makes teachers tick or children learn, or some learn and others not, or which techniques should get credit and which not. Many of the differences of our aims or goals surfaced during this period.

The 1960's were also a period of the civil rights movement, a period when both youth and teachers decided they would not accept traditional authority. Teachers immediately latched onto the new knowledge that really we knew nothing about teaching of education, or about anything else for that matter, which is only a slight exaggeration.

Principals and superintendents would come into a room and start observing the teacher. The teacher would say to the principal, "What gives you the right to come into my room to take a look at what I am doing, and to write up a report that says we know nothing about what is good and what is bad in this field?And what what gives you the right to tell me what to do, when we are both equally ignorant?" That worked for about five minutes, until a group of parents would walk in and say the same things to the teacher: "What gives you the right to teach here on salary and to tell me as a teacher your judgment is more expert than the Parents' Association or some community group's?" I have related this because I think it is very clear that professionals have come under great attack, largely because the public has come to share their knowledge. Most professionals have a group of professional secrets which are not shared with outsiders, but teachers do not. In other professions, society protects itself by licensing and saying that only those who have the secrets can carry on the practice.

But the situation is more complicated. One group is licensed and protected, yet doesn't have this bunch of secrets. It is to the great

interest of the professionals in our field that a comparable set of practices of expertise is being developed. It is very necessary from a kind of professional, selfish point of view for superintendents, principals and teachers, and others of the school establishment, to have a particular set of competencies which are recognized. They can be the basis of an authority relationship with students, parents, communities, and political figures. We would like to be able to stand before groups like this and say "Fine, we are hopping on this bandwagon because it is good for everybody. It is good for the profession and it will certainly be good for the children and for everybody." Unfortunately, we can't say this, and I for one am critical of what is being sold to us.

First, I want to state my agreement with the previous speaker. I am a graduate of the University of Illinois, and my major was philosophy. Maybe we contracted the same habits or diseases or whatever; but one of the things I learned from my philosophy professors was that if something means everything it means nothing. When something is defined in such a broad way that nothing more is valid, then it is functionally meaningless. It is not provable and it is not disprovable. You can't really discuss it. It is like the notion of the Oedipus Complex, in Freudian theory. We can put somebody on the couch and charge X number of dollars for each fifty minutes and keep probing and keep asking, "Have you found it yet, have you found it?"--and finally the guy says "All right, I have found my Oedipus Complex." That "proves" that he has one. But if we take thirty years and he still hasn't found it, we still decide that he has one, but is repressing it and doesn't want to think about it.

Now I would say the same kind of thing about competency-based teacher education, certification, or licensing, or a small complex of ideas; if competency means anything, it is directed to little bits that might be called techniques or technology. We can argue about whether that is enough. But if we are then told, "Oh, no, by 'competencies' we mean the ability to understand the particular thing the teacher is doing from the point of view of Plato, Aristotle, Hegel, John Dewey and everybody else," then we are including

not only the little bits of things the teachers have to do but everything between that and total understanding from all perspectives. Then it doesn't mean anything because we are defining a very spectacular set of individuals who can do everything perfectly and can understand everything, at every level, from top to bottom. Who can be against that? We have said, "What we ought to do in teacher education is develop excellent teachers," but it doesn't tell us how, what, when, or anything else.

I am suspicious not only of the way competency is so broadly defined, but also of the tremendous effort to sell something to the public which does not exist. This is one of the greatest dangers we face in education. One of the reasons the public is so fed up is that every couple of years we come out with a sexy looking answer. We tell the public that now finally we have it. It is on the front pages of the newspaper, on television, you name it. Inside of ten minutes there is renewed cynicism on the part of the public and of the professionals because of the number of these great innovations which they have been subjected to in the past. Most, of course, have had no merit except public relations. After competency based certification was imposed on one state last year, the State Education Department sent the form throughout the state saying that all programs must be stated in competency terms. Every institution sat down, figured what they were doing, and got hold of somebody who was willing to learn the terminology of "competency" and rewrite everything they were doing already and then sent it in. The same would, of course, happen in New York. A lot of blood is shed in this kind of "revolution" but when it is all over it is only the picture on the wall that has been changed.

We have a right to be suspicious in the present case because we are confronted with a package of proposals from out State Education Department and State Education Departments all over the country. Among these are one for performance certification and performance contracting. Why not get companies specializing in these particular competencies? We had that experiment in a number of places within the last few years. I bring this up because, in any field in which we are dealing not with the sale of a book or

a radio or some product but with something with a certain amount of complexity, society usually tries to protect the public. What do we do when a doctor decides that he has something that is going to cure an incurable disease and he wants to stand on a corner and peddle his pills? We take that doctor and haul him before the court and call him a quack. There are similar protections for the public in the field of dentistry and in other fields. What do we do when we find someone who has been practicing medicine for fifteen years without a license? Do we turn around and ask whether he has done a better job than the licensed practitioner and say maybe we shouldn't have medical education? We throw him in jail for practicing without having the sanction of the gov[illegible]ent.

The point is that performance contracting and competency based certification are quackery; that is, we are selling to the public and profession something which does not exist. The way this is coming across is not as a twenty, thirty, forty or fifty year complex research program in which perhaps we will get a little bit closer to answering some of the questions. This is not the way it is being sold. The edicts are being sent out to schools, and legislators are passing bills all across the country mandating competency-based certification after debate in the state legislatures with all their sophistication about education. When this gets to our newspapers and parent associations, they all say it is terrific -- we are finally going to do things on the basis of competency. But what are we doing? We are really creating the impression that up to now we have been incompetent; finally a law will make all of us competent right away.

We in the educational community have a specific question on this notion of "performance." Is the educational institution and its practitioners "performance" to be evaluated and measured in terms of product? That is, are teachers to be evaluated, retained, licensed, and compensated on the basis of their students' math or reading scores? This sort of notion is all right when you go out and buy a television set; you pay for a television set and want to get a television set. But when you pay your taxes and send your child to school, you don't have a guarantee that your child is go-

ing to make a year's progress in a year. What would you say about a doctor who sees thirty patients within a period of time, treats these patients, and all thirty die? Well, if he is a cancer specialist you might say he was very brave because maybe he prolonged life and relieved pain. It might very well be that the medical world would say he did an excellent job. What would you say about a lawyer that loses X number of cases in a row? Would you say he is a terrible lawyer? Well, doesn't it depend on the cases? Isn't it possible that the arguments the lawyer used or his particular strategy might actually make legal history? The lost cases might be studied by lawyers for years, whereas a lawyer who won his last fifty cases might be a glorified bill collector taking easy jobs.

What I am trying to say is that in the fields of medicine, law, dentistry and engineering (and other fields where there has been honest and competent endeavor over a period of time), they didn't call it "competency-based." They just went ahead improving until they developed competent practices in those fields. Doctors can look at what they have done, and there would be widespread agreement as to whether they had practiced competently or incompetently or supercompetently; the same could be done in dentistry, engineering and fields like that.

This does not exist in the field we are in. We are talking not about how many points a contestant or student scores, but about the practice. We are talking not about whether the patient died but about what the doctor did and what any competent doctor would do under similar circumstances. We are talking about the practic the basic decision. If you tell me that we are really talking not only about practice, but about everything else I have mentioned, then what is the point of coming to a conference? If this is what you are talking about, this is what we have been about all along, and there is no need to do anything special; but please explain what it is that is supposed to be done so differently.

We are concerned because many so-called educational innovations have sprung up recently. While they are justified to the public as the way of improving education and improving practice, they

sometimes are much more related to the political atmosphere, and more particularly, to the economics of supporting education. You will excuse me if I express this publicly. But if we are going to level with each other, then I think we have to say that if those of us who are teachers and who represent teachers see something being sold that doesn't exist, and we acquiesce in this, then we too are blameworthy.

We suspect that concepts of performance-based education are related to a number of other items. One is the notion that the most expensive ingredient in education is personnel, after construction. While the superintendent makes more money, and the principal makes more money, the real money spent is for the large number of teachers that have to be employed. They reason that teachers are so expensive because they invested in a college education -- five years or six years of it -- and expect some sort of economic return from it. Maybe they feel you don't need a college education to be a teacher. After all, we have a decade of new writers that tell us that one of the reasons that schools are no good is that there is too much of an educational gap between students and teachers. Maybe if teachers weren't as educated as they are, they would be closer to the students they are teaching and would be able to understand them better. There is no evidence that having a Master's degree or a Bachelor's degree or taking any course of instruction makes one a good teacher. Maybe teaching, after all, is a set of performing skills. If you want to know if someone is an artist on the piano you don't require him to take a Ph.D. or a Master's degree in music. He practices the piano and he gets those skills and that is that. And if you want someone who is an actor or actress on the stage, you don't require him to take a degree in drama. You help him get performance skills.

Maybe what we ought to do in the education of teachers is not what we have been doing all along: Maybe we don't need people with Bachelor's degrees and Master's degrees with courses in Philosophy of Education. Maybe we need something more like what the boy scouts have when they get to be Eagle Scouts. No boy who becomes an Eagle Scout has been to Eagle college. You take one step at a time: you take your fourteen mile hike, you swim twenty-five yards with one stroke, you light a fire with two matches, and you cook something. After you pass six steps you are

a second class scout. After another ten, you are first; then a star scout with merit badges, and so forth. The teacher would fit in with the "models of differentiation," which is another way of taking educated professionals away from children. You can start children with a tenderfoot and then develop differentiations. We can have something more like a Boy Scout Troop than an educational institution as we know it today. It would be a total restructuring of the school system, without any educational justification.

So what, then, is the reason for this tremendous force in state after state, legislature after legislature, Education Department after Education Department? It is not that there is a great new idea to help children to learn; it is that there is a possibility of reducing the economic commitment of our society to public education. We ought to face that fact.

In some ways it is a very good idea that people might be able to get a degree without going to college. That is fine, but how many such degrees have been issued in New York State? Who is really checking up on whether those degrees are worth anything or not? What are we doing in the state, if we are interested in the standards of education, to prevent thousands of people who are not licensed from teaching in the classroom? Why is the State Education Department talking about training teachers while, throughout the state, it is accepted that standards are not being adhered to and non-teacher-licensed assistants are being given full charge of classrooms? I just cannot accept the notion that there is an interest in improving performance and standards. From what I see, State Education Departments and legislatures across the country are weakening standards. I would like to know what the State Education Department is <u>really</u> trying to do. There is hardly an occupation in this state where you do not have to take a written examination to show that you have a basic competency; but you do not have to take a written examination in the state to become a teacher. Either examinations are equally not valid for other groups, or you are saying that every group must be tested other than teachers -- because it is easy to determine if teachers know anything. However, it is possible to give teachers a math test or an English test or social studies test, but the state has decided not to

do it; and at the very same time testing is ignored, the State Education Department is prescribing a new program based on "competency."

This program is connected to the notion of recertification. The State pushes the idea that what is terrible about the schools is teacher incompetency. Therefore it would be wise to get rid of tenure and have the state define what competencies are. First, you make sure no teacher comes in without these competencies, and then you go back every five or six years and check. Of course, you may find five years from now that there are new competencies or competencies are switched around, or you may find that society has changed or that persons may lose competencies; so this is a way in which we can decide every couple of years who shall be removed. Well, I would like to say that I have not seen that the State Education Department, which licenses practically all occupations in the State, takes such an attitude towards other occupations. I have not seen them say they will check the medical profession every five years and take away the license to practice from any doctor who has not brushed up or been re-educated within the last five years on the new techniques developed in medicine, or in law or dentistry or any other field. There is only one group that is being singled out, and I would say here again that that focus is related to the economics of the whole situation.

I think we ought to be clear that there is really one of two directions to which this notion will lead. One is the narrow one: which is that the competencies will be defined very narrowly and teachers will be measured on the basis of excellence in particular tests. I do not have to go into what is wrong with that and I do not have to go into that narrow type of approach which would be totally destructive educationally. Actually teachers would fare very well in it, as everybody does in a similar situation. Teachers will cheat and it will mean they get the answers, as everybody does when put under that sort of pressure. They will all become master teachers. On the other hand if things are not defined so narrowly and you are going to start talking about understanding the whole thing, obviously you cannot restrict it to narrow measurable products

among teachers themselves, in spite of this proposal.

We have gone through year after year of innovations. We have never found one that was really intended to help the student. It was usually intended to help some superintendent, principal, state commissioner, or state education department. It makes them look awfully good to come out with new ideas in the papers every year; you never hear about them removing those ideas every year or two. No experiment they try ever fails -- as we say, "every experiment is doomed to succeed." We know what educational innovation is like. Every few years we get rid of the school superintendent who brought in innovations a couple of years before, and we go out and hire a guy who was fired three districts down the road. We bring in all his innovations and we advertise them as the latest cure for all out ills. I would submit that the time has come when, if we want the institution of public education to inspire confidence, we ought to stop with the business of innovative change. You do not hear of doctors going out saying, "Gee, I had four patients today with the same disease and, boy, did I innovate! I gave them ten different cures." If you have an answer, if you have a cure that is really a cure, you should use that, and not make a virtue of coming in every couple of months trying to convince people you are doing something when the whole purpose is public relations because that is what is being done. It is more related to the saving of dollars. The real emphasis is to substitute limited competencies for college and university educations and to bring in "boy-scout" teachers who know about fourteen mile hikes but do not understand what they are doing. One of the points Mr. Gazzetta said we must all agree on is that there will not be a lot more money for education and teacher training and that when making speeches we must recognize there is not going to be any more money for education for a long time. Therefore, we have to make do. Well, I have given up on getting more money for education, as I think most of us have in this field. I think that this is where you lag when you give up the real fight. Don't let us kid ourselves. In industry they do not spend one or two percent of their budget on training, on education, on research or on development. If we really meant it, we would not be spending millions of dollars, but we

would be spending hundreds of millions of dollars in this area of human research to find out what really works better. We would not be throwing teachers into a classroom after a couple of courses, whether of the intellectual or the technological kind. We would support the notion of internships of three, four or five years, where a beginning teacher would spend time with an experienced teacher, and afford that teacher an opportunity to acquire the skills that teachers need. But, no, we do not have proposals like that, because it costs money, and, after all, we have to pay that intern for a period of years.....and we would have to give extra time to the teacher already there to help this student.

It is exactly this that any intelligent person would support. If you really wanted to improve teacher education -- if this meant that there was to be research to find techniques that work to share with teachers -- there would be nobody against that. If what is meant is that teacher training gives only theory, but no technology, and that technology must be added to it, I do not think that anybody would quarrel with that either; but that is not worth the front page of the New York Times, and it is not worth it to all the institutions in the world to tell them they have to redefine and restate everything in their practices.

There is one more thing, and that is that no change can be brought about without the cooperation of the people affected. I would say the State Education Department has not really sought that cooperation. I would go a step further: they are not going to get that cooperation as long as there is a feeling on the part of the people involved that they are threatened by changes that you want to bring about. That is true of college professors, teachers' training institutions and classroom teachers. It might be true of people that work for the State Education Department. If we proposed changes that would hinder you in doing the important work you are doing now, you might resist. I would hope that when such changes were proposed you might cooperate, but I would not blame you for protecting your institution and your job; so, please do not blame us for our reaction when you talk about certification and going in there to see if someone who has been performing sa-

tisfactorily for five, ten or fifteen years doesn't have the particular competencies that you came up with that year, and advising them that you are not going to recertify them and that they cannot practice anymore. Please do not think we are any more narrow or selfish than anyone who works for the State Education Department.

Thank you.

In appreciation to Mrs. Phyllis Lapidese for her audiotape of Mr. Shanker's address.

An address by
Dr. Sheldon Stoff

The New York State Department of Education has presented us with an accomplished revolution in the concept of the educated man. On November, 1972 it mandated a distorted concept of Performance Based Teacher Education and only then helped conduct a series of hearings throughout the State in an effort to collect data about the mandated model. Approximately 85% of those providing testimony opposed the State mandate so their views were promptly dismissed as meaningless and confused.

Let there be no mistake: in print and in private conversation, the State has imposed a narrowly conceived view of education. Yet one is happy to note that recently, in public conversation, it has backed off from its doctrinaire position. It's time to call a moratorium on this ill-considered mandate and to get busy working out the reforms we actually need.

Let us look at the very serious shortcomings we see in this suddenly imposed model of teacher-education.

1. It has no empirical base.
2. It is Skinnerian in its definitions of psychological and philosophical truth.

3. It offers a distorted view of teaching and learning.
4. It industrializes education.
5. It is anti-intellectual.
6. It denies freedom to the University and to the student.
7. It may be costly.
8. It may well harm those economically disadvantaged students it is primarily designed to help.
9. Its legality is questionable.

1. P.B.T.E. has no empirical basis.

The State does not offer even the claim of empirical validation. Certainly the lack of positive results in Florida, Washington and Oregon ought to have sounded the signal for caution. The only justification one hears from Albany is, "It's an act of faith." Is that enough justification to impose a new learning dogma?

What of the history of similar movements? Dean Griffiths, of New York University, shares the following with us:

> During the 1920's there was a similar movement called elementalist psychology, which took teacher education by storm. In this instance (as in the current model) the idea was to take what the child was to learn and break it up into very small pieces...It was quickly found that while the children did learn the elements, they had no idea what it meant when they learned all the bits. The sum of the parts did not equal the whole...As if these failures were not enough, during the 1950's the Cooperative Program in Educational Administration sponsored by the Southeast Center of the Kellogg Foundation spent hundreds of thousands of dollars on the competency approach to training school administrators. Needless to say, that was also a failure.[1]

2. P.B.T.E. is Skinnerian in its definitions of psychological and philosophical truth.

In one educator's description, "That P.B.T.E. does accept a

foundational behavioristic or Skinnerian psychology and conceptualization of the nature of man, is apparent from its avowed acceptance of behavior as the only aspect of individual human life as both necessary and sufficient conditions for the 'competent' teacher.[2]

To further place P.B.T.E. in the Skinner box we read a second description by proponents of this model:

> Desired teaching behaviors are specified in self-paced packages, and a demonstration of proficiency is needed for each competency before credit is awarded...Many competency programs are based on a systems approach. (The student) takes a pre-test, studies the text material, works in the learning lab, and then takes the post-test. This step-by-step progression through discrete units may leave the student with a fractional view of the content, skills and abilities, and thus blur his overview.[3]

Alternative views of the teaching-learning act are not accepted unless they conform to the specific format described by the State, which is very similar to the above. Linear, automated instruction is inevitable. "Explicit competencies and objective assessment" are the new rule.[4]

The State confirms the intent of the above procedures by a statement of "Educational Rights of Students"[5] which goes far to institutionalize distrust between the student and his teachers. This statement insists upon lists of publicly stated competencies to be achieved and upon the pre-test/post-test, linear formula for success.

In contrast, Abraham Maslow offers a different view of the teaching-learning act when he says:

> The holistic way of thinking and seeing seems to come quite naturally and automatically to healthier, self-actualizing people, and seems to be extraordinarily difficult for less evolved, less mature people. . .[6] We can con-

> ceive either that we are studying a discrete entity, or that we are studying a part of a whole. The former method we may call reductive-analytic. One essential characteristic of holistic analysis of the personality in actual practice is that there be a preliminary study or understanding of the total organism, and that we then proceed to study the role that our part of the whole plays in the organization and dynamics of the total organism.[7]

The fact that an education program with a holistic view simply cannot prosper in the pre-test/post-test, solitary performance, mechanized format has not been acknowledged by the State, although our communications have been many.

3. P.B.T.E. offers a distorted view of teaching and learning.

Task-set education seems dangerously archaic and distorted.

> In the view of Deikman, author of "Bimodal Consciousness,"
>
> > The crises now facing the human race are technically solvable. Controlling population, reducing pollution, and eliminating racism and war do not require new inventions. Yet these problems may prove fatally insolvable because what is required is a shift in values, in self-definition, and in world view on the part of each person --for it is the individual consciousness that is the problem. Our survival is threatened now because of our great success in manipulating our environment and acting on others. The action mode has ruled our individual lives and our national politics, and the I-It relationship (the heart of the behavioral objectives of PBTE) that has provided the base for technical mastery is now the primary obstacle to saving our race. If, however, each person were able to feel an identity with other persons and with his environment, to see himself as part of a larger unity, he would have that sense of oneness that supports the selfless actions necessary to regulate population

> growth, minimize pollution, and end war. The receptive mode we have been discussing is the mode in which this identification--the I-Thou relationship--exists, and it may be needed to provide the experiential base for the values and world view now needed so desperately by our society as a whole.[8]

Unfortunately, the State planners seem completely unaware of the nature of bimodal consciousness and have presented us with a theory of learning invalidated by current work in physiology and psychology. In Pine's words, "two very different persons inhabit our heads, residing in the left and right hemispheres of our brains, the twin shells that cover the central brain stem. One of them is verbal, analytic, dominant. The other is artistic. . ."[9] To mandate a theory of learning that develops but half of man's potentiality for learning is hardly a public service. Massive and serious distortions to individual personalities seem inevitable.

In practical terms, there are honest hopes at the core of P.B.T.E., but the thrust has gone far astray. The distortion of man and his relation to learning will have devastating results. There is no uplifting thought or attitude to be found in explicit packets, in programmed machines; yet without idealism a nation will surely perish. A philosophy and psychology that does not recognize freedom or dignity or idealism is surely inadequate to meet the needs of today's youth.

In the words of Fantini and Weinstein,

> Our present educational system gives highest priority to cognitive content and regards other content areas merely as instruments for getting to prescribed cognitive content. The prevailing assumption is that by mastering cognitive content, the individual learns to behave appropriately as a citizen in an open society. We question the validity of this assumption that extrinsic subject matter alone can lead to humanitarian behavior--that is, whether the cognitive man is necessarily the humanitarian man.

4. P.B.T.E. industrializes education.

What the State offers is termed by Yardley of England as "the factory system, where the American pupil is taught mainly to pass tests by memorizing the right answer. But merely teaching children to respond to questions with the right answer is like teaching baboons to do tricks."[11]

Canada's Ernest Stickel sees our schools turning out students on a "piecework basis." In this year's performance model the teacher is really an "inspector on an assembly line." It is sad that a nation which nurtured Ralph Waldo Emerson could, again in Stickel's words, be so caught up in trying to "teach students how to make a living--instead of how to live. Emotional values, philosophy, life goals, are being left untouched."[12]

In another time, facing a similar problem, Raymond Callahan said in his book, Education and the Cult of Efficiency,

> The tragedy itself was fourfold; that educational questions were subordinated to business considerations; that administrators were produced who were not, in any true sense, educators; that a scientific label was put on some very unscientific and dubious methods and practices; and that an anti-intellectual climate, already prevalent, was strengthened. As the business-industrial values and procedures spread into the thinking and acting of educators, countless educational decisions were made on economic or non-educational grounds.[13]

If one reads the brochure of The Teacher Education Developmental Services Center in Albany one finds the following support services listed:

a. Workshops on topics such as management problems, preparing instructional packages. . .

b. Problem management and evaluation. . .
   --technological delivery systems
   --record keeping. . .

c. Available software

Would you believe that we're still speaking of educating children, and not producing salami?

5. P.B.T.E. is anti-intellectual.

When speaking of the fifth year of college education, surely a minimum mark of professionalism, Dr. Lierheimer of the New York State Department of Education has offered a proposal that the Master's degree be no longer required, but that "continuing certification be based on performance criteria applied locally."[14] The New York Regents have stated, "It is planned that the requirement for the Master's degree or 30 graduate credits will no longer be necessary for permanent certification."[15]

It is undeniably perverse that at a time of teacher surplus, at a time of knowledge explosion, at a time when parents are demanding more of the schools, the State planners should lower the professional requirements for teachers. They offer two arguments in support of their move:

a. There would be substantial savings in increment pay to teachers (speaker: but at a cost to students that we dare not calculate).

b. When schools move to programmed instruction or packets, trained teachers become unnecessary. One teacher in such a school pointed out to me that a good high school student could do his job. The State's direction in this matter is rational only if we are changing our whole concept of the teaching-learning process. To the State planners, education is a matter of linear, pre-packaged learning in terms of explicit behavioral objectives. There is no need to recruit or support the kind of teacher who can challenge the intellect by asking the most important questions: Why learn? Why live?

Dean Griffiths phrased it this way,

Competency based teacher education as it is presently proposed is the height of anti-intellectualism. It presumes to reduce teaching to a set of performances that can be imitated by relatively untrained people such as para-professionals. Competency-based teacher education as it appears to be conceived and practiced is quite the opposite of the professional approach to teaching. that is, the education of teachers who are conceptualizers, who understand their tasks in a broad, theoretical framework.[16]

6. P.B.T.E. denies freedom to both the university and the student.

Leo Ruth concludes that "words like 'systems,' 'behavior,' 'objective,' 'program,' 'freedom,' 'learning,' and 'individualized instruction' take on special meanings, thus imposing problems of translation and trapping the unwary into wrongly assuming a consensus exists whereas little, if any does." Take for example, the idea of freedom. George A. Miller, a Harvard psychologist states, "Within the broad limits set by what materials have been prepared for the computer, the student is free to study those things that are of most interest to him!"[17]

In the view of Charles Hampden-Turner, however, the packets and the computer offer "the freedom of a rat to run a maze by turning left or right on any of a hundred separate occasions. . ."[18]

Hampden-Turner concludes:

> Freedom in the existential, rule-transcending sense does not seem to lie within the comprehension of many technocrats or social scientists. We have a whole generation of academics with a trained incapacity to understand what freedom is, since there is no room for it in their philosophy of science. On the contrary (to Miller) men are the supreme rule followers of the animan kingdom.[19]

Robert F. Bundy, Planning Consultant to the State Education Department, reacts to the issue of human freedom and initiative with the following:

> By humanistic preplanning I mean an unqualified belief

in the value of the voluntary, spontaneous, and self-determining dimensions of human experience; concern for the dignity and human development of the person; being nonmanipulative and nonexploitive; a conviction that each person has a historical vocation to become fully human.

Here we find what to me is the most tragic aspect of much educational planning today. Consciously or unconsciously, kids are thought of as aspects; things without identities to be processed through buildings and systems; 'input' which has to be modified before it can become 'output'; restless spirits which have to be taught docility, submissiveness, and unyielding loyalty; an irrational proletariat likely to do violent things if control is relaxed; economic liabilities to be turned into professional consumers, guinea pigs for behavioral experimentation.[20]

A university is a frail institution vulnerable to confrontation. Several years ago we witnessed an attack on the universities from within. The student movement did not succeed in its attempt to seize control. Now another movement would impose crippling restrictions upon the university by demanding that control of what shall be taught, and how it shall be taught, must pass from the university to outside agencies whose aims are often in conflict.

Truth is not determined by majority vote.

In 1963 we witnessed strong attempts on the part of outside forces to control university faculty expression at the University of Mississippi. This attempt finally failed.[21] A university must, of course, work with the public, but its final decisions cannot be determined by outsiders. We cannot allow political infringement of university prerogatives without destroying academic initiative and responsibility.

7. P.B.T.E. may be costly.

According to its advocates "definitive studies of what P.B.T.E. programs cost do not exist. Studies which have been done indicate that P.B.T.E. programs may be more costly. In any case, the development costs will be substantial."[22]

8. P.B.T.E. may well harm those economically disadvantaged students it is primarily designed to help.

If one is aware of the research of Stodolsky and Lesser,[23] it becomes clear that individualized instruction ought at least recognize differences in learning patterns; e.g., the black child seems to succeed best in an early learning pattern which is non-abstract and non-cognitive. Their finding is supported by the recent brain research of Pines, which shows that "children from poor black neighborhoods generally learn to use their right hemisphere (the intuitive-aesthetic) more than their left."[17] Discrete entity or task-set education stresses the wrong mode of learning for the ghetto child. It may well prove most harmful to those it is intended to aid.

When this mandate was first proposed, a black teacher of an inner city school remarked to me, "This is a racist view of education. No white man could possibly want to send his children to such a school."

9. The legality of the State mandate is questionable. We are faced with an unacceptable encroachment upon academic freedoms.

In the case of Pierce V. Society of the Sisters of the Holy Name (268 US 510) 1925 the Supreme Court stated:

> The fundamental theory of liberty upon which all governments in this Union repose excludes any general power of the state to standardize its children by forcing them to accept instruction from public school teachers only. The child is not the mere creature of the state.[25]

I fully believe that the prime concern of the court was the stan

dardization of the children. If all teacher education programs must follow the State behavioristic model there will be no choice for students or their parents. The source that provides teachers will have been restricted to one pattern, with some wrinkles of variability, but all cut from the same cloth. Standardization will have been achieved! Can we afford the price? Can we allow this precedent to stand? Can we ever allow a State to impose any kind of standardized model upon the whole university world, regardless of whether our opinion of the current format is positive or negative?

We are facing a violation, if not of the letter of the law, certainly of the spirit of the law.

We believe in a pluralism of teacher education programs. It would be wrong to exclude the Skinner approach to teacher education. It is equally wrong to exclude psychological and philosophical orientations that run contrary to B.F. Skinner.

Individual members of the State Education Department should be leading the cry against the State Education Department's ever having the authority to impose one education model for all. To concede this point is to concede the independence of the university at a time when we've witnessed the grossest intrusions on many of the institutions necessary to preserve democracy.

In conclusion, it appears to me that we have indeed come to the brink. The time of Double Think has arrived. Dr. Nyquist is describing explicit behavioral objectives as humanistic education, although there is a clear contradiction in terms! The holistic view of the humanist and the discrete entity of the behaviorist require very different formats and guidelines!

The State Education Department format mandates explicit public objectives, discrete tasks, a pre-test/post-test format, and says that freedom is maximized even if we view the psychological base of all this as insufficient.

The State can not have it both ways! It has imposed a consistent-

ly behavioristic model on people when they should have offered it as one of many alternatives. Now is the time for clarity, not Double Think. There cannot be freedom under a philosophy and psychology that denies the very possibility of freedom!

Basic skills can be taught without a P.B.T.E. model. We believe that they ought never to be isolated from the larger view. We also believe that teachers educated in a holistic orientation will prove far more competent than their task-set counterparts.

Many of us believe that human decision making counts. Many of us believe in the possibility of freedom. Many of us believe, with the Hebrews of old, that the word "to know" also means "loving embrace." Authentic knowledge is developed through a way of meeting that is foreign to the task-set and most difficult to quantify. Many of us believe, along with a modern sage, that "the sum of a life is the sum of its unconditionedness."[26]

NOTES

1. Dean Daniel Griffiths, "Intellectualism and Professionalism" in New York University Education Quarterly, Fall 1973, p. 3.

2. Dr. Betty Sichel, Statement before the Faculty, C.W. Post Center, Oct. 1973.

3. Getz, Kennedy, Pierce, Edwards and Chesebro, "From Traditional to Competency-Based Education" in Phi Delta Kappa, January 1973.

4. Letter from Dr. Gazetta, 2-28-73 - a theme repeated through the State "Format" and other material.

5. The Educational Rights of Students Enrolled in Teacher Education Programs, New York State Education Department.

6. Abraham Mazlow, Motivation and Personality, Harper and Row, 1970. p. xi.

7. Ibid, p. 297.

8. Arthur J. Deikman, "Bimodal Consciousness" from Archives of General Psychiatry, p. 25 (Dec. 1971) 481-489.

9. Maya Pines, "We are Left-Brained or Right-Brained" in The New York Times Magazine, April 11, 1973, p. 21.

10. Fantini and Weinstein, Toward Humanistic Education, The Ford Foundation, 1970. p. 31.

11. Alice Yardley, Chief Lecturer, Nottingham College of Education, England.

12. Dr. Ernest Sticker, Professor, University of Calgary School of Social Welfare, Canada.

13. Raymond E. Callahan, Education and the Cult of Efficiency, The University of Chicago Press, 1962. pp. 246-7.

14. Dr. Lierheimer, in Performance, U.S. Office of Education #OEC-0-71-3315, 9/3/71. p. 108.

15. New York Regents, Education Beyond High School, 1972, p. 54.

16. Dean Daniel Griffiths, "Intellectualism and Professionalism", in Education Quarterly, New York University, Fall 1973, p. 2.

17. Leo, Ruth, "Dangers of System Think in Education" in Accountability and the Teaching of English, National Council of Teachers of English 1972.

18. Charles Hampden-Turner, Radical Men: The Process of Psycho-Social Development, p. 321.

19. Ibid, p. 322.

20. Robert F. Bundy, "Stargazing or Science" in Inside Education, Sept. 1973.

21. The New York Times, April 11, 1963, p. 21.

22. AACTE, Implementing PBTE at the State Level, 1973.

23. Stodolsky and Lesser, Harvard Educational Review, Fall, 1967.

24. U.S. Supreme Court Decision, Pierce v. Society of the Sisters of the Holy Name (268 U.S. 510) 1925.

25. Martin Buber, Daniel, McGraw-Hill, pp. 143-44.

Resolved:

This conference goes on record as opposing the State's proposal, particularly the imposition of the PBTE model. It calls upon the State Education Department to hold all further implementation until a vehicle for the review, acceptance and development of programs can be devised. Such a vehicle must include teacher education institutions, teacher organizations and school districts in an operative role which goes far beyond mere consultation.

For: 71
Opposed: 9
Abstentions: 12

The Department of Education of Adelphi University later adopted the following resolution:

The time has come for separating the state certification of school practitioners from the evaluation of programs preparing practitioners. The certification procedure for entry into practice could be in the hands of a state-wide professional board made up of teachers, professional educators representing school districts and representatives of the universities. The Bachelor's degree would be a co-requisite or pre-requisite for provisional certification. The Master's degree would be co-requisite or pre-requisite for permanent certification after a supervised internship. The preparation programs should be left to the universities.